



[7590-01-P]

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[NRC-2019-0079]

### Biweekly Notice

#### **Applications and Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses and Combined Licenses Involving No Significant Hazards Considerations**

**AGENCY:** Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**ACTION:** Biweekly notice.

**SUMMARY:** Pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is publishing this regular biweekly notice. The Act requires the Commission to publish notice of any amendments issued, or proposed to be issued, and grants the Commission the authority to issue and make immediately effective any amendment to an operating license or combined license, as applicable, upon a determination by the Commission that such amendment involves no significant hazards consideration, notwithstanding the pendency before the Commission of a request for a hearing from any person.

This biweekly notice includes all notices of amendments issued, or proposed to be issued, from February 26, 2019 to March 11, 2019. The last biweekly notice was published on March 12, 2019.

**DATES:** Comments must be filed by **[INSERT DATE 30 DAYS AFTER DATE OF PUBLICATION IN THE *FEDERAL REGISTER*]**. A request for a hearing must be filed by **[INSERT DATE 60 DAYS AFTER DATE OF PUBLICATION IN THE *FEDERAL REGISTER*]**. Comments received after this date will be considered if it is practical to do so, but the Commission is able to ensure consideration only for comments received before this date.

**ADDRESSES:** You may submit comments by any of the following methods (unless this document describes a different method for submitting comments on a specific subject):

- **Federal Rulemaking Web Site:** Go to <http://www.regulations.gov> and search for Docket ID **NRC-2019-0079**. Address questions about NRC dockets IDs in Regulations.gov to Jennifer Borges; telephone: 301-287-9127; e-mail: Jennifer.Borges@nrc.gov. For technical questions, contact the individual(s) listed in the FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT section of this document.

- **Mail comments to:** Office of Administration, Mail Stop: TWFN-7-A60M, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, ATTN: Program Management, Announcements and Editing Staff.

For additional direction on obtaining information and submitting comments, see “Obtaining Information and Submitting Comments” in the SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION section of this document.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Ikeda Betts, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington DC 20555-0001; telephone: 301-415-1959, e-mail: Ikeda.Betts@nrc.gov.

## **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

### **I. Obtaining Information and Submitting Comments**

#### **A. Obtaining Information**

Please refer to Docket ID **NRC-2019-0079**, facility name, unit number(s), plant docket number, application date, and subject when contacting the NRC about the availability of information for this action. You may obtain publicly-available information related to this action by any of the following methods:

- **Federal Rulemaking Web Site:** Go to <http://www.regulations.gov> and search for Docket ID **NRC-2019-0079**.

- **NRC's Agencywide Documents Access and Management System**

**(ADAMS):** You may obtain publicly-available documents online in the ADAMS Public Documents collection at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html>. To begin the search, select "Begin Web-based ADAMS Search." For problems with ADAMS, please contact the NRC's Public Document Room (PDR) reference staff at 1-800-397-4209, 301-415-4737, or by e-mail to [pdr.resource@nrc.gov](mailto:pdr.resource@nrc.gov). The ADAMS accession number for each document referenced (if it is available in ADAMS) is provided the first time that it is mentioned in this document.

- **NRC's PDR:** You may examine and purchase copies of public documents at the NRC's PDR, Room O1-F21, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland 20852.

#### B. Submitting Comments

Please include Docket ID **NRC-2019-0079**, facility name, unit number(s), plant docket number, application date, and subject in your comment submission.

The NRC cautions you not to include identifying or contact information that you do not want to be publicly disclosed in your comment submission. The NRC will post all comment submissions at <http://www.regulations.gov> as well as enter the comment submissions into ADAMS. The NRC does not routinely edit comment submissions to remove identifying or contact information.

If you are requesting or aggregating comments from other persons for submission to the NRC, then you should inform those persons not to include identifying or contact information that they do not want to be publicly disclosed in their comment submission. Your request should state that the NRC does not routinely edit comment submissions to remove such information before making the comment submissions available to the public or entering the comment into ADAMS.

## **II. Background**

Pursuant to Section 189a.(2) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is publishing this regular biweekly notice. The Act requires the Commission to publish notice of any amendments issued, or proposed to be issued, and grants the Commission the authority to issue and make immediately effective any amendment to an operating license or combined license, as applicable, upon a determination by the Commission that such amendment involves no significant hazards consideration, notwithstanding the pendency before the Commission of a request for a hearing from any person.

### **III. Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses and Combined Licenses and Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination**

The Commission has made a proposed determination that the following amendment requests involve no significant hazards consideration. Under the Commission's regulations in § 50.92 of title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR), this means that operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. The basis for this proposed determination for each amendment request is shown below.

The Commission is seeking public comments on this proposed determination. Any comments received within 30 days after the date of publication of this notice will be considered in making any final determination.

Normally, the Commission will not issue the amendment until the expiration of 60 days after the date of publication of this notice. The Commission may issue the license amendment before expiration of the 60-day period provided that its final determination is that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration. In addition, the Commission may issue the amendment prior to the expiration of the 30-day comment period if circumstances change during the 30-day comment period such that failure to act in a timely way would result, for example in derating or shutdown of the facility. If the Commission takes action prior to the expiration of either the comment period or the notice period, it will publish in the *Federal Register* a notice of issuance. If the Commission makes a final no significant hazards consideration determination, any hearing will take place after issuance. The Commission expects that the need to take this action will occur very infrequently.

#### **A. Opportunity to Request a Hearing and Petition for Leave to Intervene**

Within 60 days after the date of publication of this notice, any persons (petitioner) whose interest may be affected by this action may file a request for a hearing and petition for leave to intervene (petition) with respect to the action. Petitions shall be filed in accordance with the Commission's "Agency Rules of Practice and Procedure" in 10 CFR part 2. Interested persons should consult a current copy of 10 CFR 2.309. The NRC's regulations are accessible electronically from the NRC Library on the NRC's Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/cfr/>. Alternatively, a copy of the regulations is available at the NRC's Public Document Room, located at One White Flint North, Room O1-F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland 20852. If a petition is filed, the Commission or a presiding officer will rule on the petition and, if appropriate, a notice of a hearing will be issued.

As required by 10 CFR 2.309(d) the petition should specifically explain the reasons why intervention should be permitted with particular reference to the following general requirements for standing: (1) the name, address, and telephone number of the petitioner; (2) the nature of the petitioner's right under the Act to be made a party to the proceeding; (3) the nature and extent of the petitioner's property, financial, or other interest in the proceeding; and (4) the possible effect of any decision or order which may be entered in the proceeding on the petitioner's interest.

In accordance with 10 CFR 2.309(f), the petition must also set forth the specific contentions which the petitioner seeks to have litigated in the proceeding. Each contention must consist of a specific statement of the issue of law or fact to be raised or controverted. In addition, the petitioner must provide a brief explanation of the bases for the contention and a concise statement of the alleged facts or expert opinion which support the contention and on which the petitioner intends to rely in proving the contention at the hearing. The petitioner must also provide references to the specific sources and documents on which the petitioner intends to rely to support its position on the issue. The petition must include sufficient information to show that a genuine dispute exists with the applicant or licensee on a material issue of law or fact. Contentions must be limited to matters within the scope of the proceeding. The contention must be one which, if proven, would entitle the petitioner to relief. A petitioner who fails to satisfy the requirements at 10 CFR 2.309(f) with respect to at least one contention will not be permitted to participate as a party.

Those permitted to intervene become parties to the proceeding, subject to any limitations in the order granting leave to intervene. Parties have the opportunity to participate fully in the conduct of the hearing with respect to resolution of that party's

admitted contentions, including the opportunity to present evidence, consistent with the NRC's regulations, policies, and procedures.

Petitions must be filed no later than 60 days from the date of publication of this notice. Petitions and motions for leave to file new or amended contentions that are filed after the deadline will not be entertained absent a determination by the presiding officer that the filing demonstrates good cause by satisfying the three factors in 10 CFR 2.309(c)(1)(i) through (iii). The petition must be filed in accordance with the filing instructions in the "Electronic Submissions (E-Filing)" section of this document.

If a hearing is requested, and the Commission has not made a final determination on the issue of no significant hazards consideration, the Commission will make a final determination on the issue of no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will serve to establish when the hearing is held. If the final determination is that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration, the Commission may issue the amendment and make it immediately effective, notwithstanding the request for a hearing. Any hearing would take place after issuance of the amendment. If the final determination is that the amendment request involves a significant hazards consideration, then any hearing held would take place before the issuance of the amendment unless the Commission finds an imminent danger to the health or safety of the public, in which case it will issue an appropriate order or rule under 10 CFR part 2.

A State, local governmental body, Federally-recognized Indian Tribe, or agency thereof, may submit a petition to the Commission to participate as a party under 10 CFR 2.309(h)(1). The petition should state the nature and extent of the petitioner's interest in the proceeding. The petition should be submitted to the Commission no later than 60 days from the date of publication of this notice. The petition must be filed in accordance

with the filing instructions in the “Electronic Submissions (E-Filing)” section of this document, and should meet the requirements for petitions set forth in this section, except that under 10 CFR 2.309(h)(2) a State, local governmental body, or Federally-recognized Indian Tribe, or agency thereof does not need to address the standing requirements in 10 CFR 2.309(d) if the facility is located within its boundaries.

Alternatively, a State, local governmental body, Federally-recognized Indian Tribe, or agency thereof may participate as a non-party under 10 CFR 2.315(c).

If a hearing is granted, any person who is not a party to the proceeding and is not affiliated with or represented by a party may, at the discretion of the presiding officer, be permitted to make a limited appearance pursuant to the provisions of 10 CFR 2.315(a). A person making a limited appearance may make an oral or written statement of his or her position on the issues but may not otherwise participate in the proceeding. A limited appearance may be made at any session of the hearing or at any prehearing conference, subject to the limits and conditions as may be imposed by the presiding officer. Details regarding the opportunity to make a limited appearance will be provided by the presiding officer if such sessions are scheduled.

## **B. Electronic Submissions (E-Filing)**

All documents filed in NRC adjudicatory proceedings, including a request for hearing and petition for leave to intervene (petition), any motion or other document filed in the proceeding prior to the submission of a request for hearing or petition to intervene, and documents filed by interested governmental entities that request to participate under 10 CFR 2.315(c), must be filed in accordance with the NRC’s E-Filing rule (72 FR 49139; August 28, 2007, as amended at 77 FR 46562; August 3, 2012). The E-Filing process requires participants to submit and serve all adjudicatory documents over the internet, or in some cases to mail copies on electronic storage media. Detailed guidance



on making electronic submissions may be found in the Guidance for Electronic Submissions to the NRC and on the NRC Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals.html>. Participants may not submit paper copies of their filings unless they seek an exemption in accordance with the procedures described below.

To comply with the procedural requirements of E-Filing, at least 10 days prior to the filing deadline, the participant should contact the Office of the Secretary by e-mail at [hearing.docket@nrc.gov](mailto:hearing.docket@nrc.gov), or by telephone at 301-415-1677, to (1) request a digital identification (ID) certificate, which allows the participant (or its counsel or representative) to digitally sign submissions and access the E-Filing system for any proceeding in which it is participating; and (2) advise the Secretary that the participant will be submitting a petition or other adjudicatory document (even in instances in which the participant, or its counsel or representative, already holds an NRC-issued digital ID certificate). Based upon this information, the Secretary will establish an electronic docket for the hearing in this proceeding if the Secretary has not already established an electronic docket.

Information about applying for a digital ID certificate is available on the NRC's public Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals/getting-started.html>. Once a participant has obtained a digital ID certificate and a docket has been created, the participant can then submit adjudicatory documents. Submissions must be in Portable Document Format (PDF). Additional guidance on PDF submissions is available on the NRC's public Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/electronic-sub-ref-mat.html>. A filing is considered complete at the time the document is submitted through the NRC's E-Filing system. To be timely, an electronic filing must be submitted to the E-Filing system no later than 11:59 p.m. Eastern Time on the due date. Upon receipt of a transmission, the E-Filing system time-stamps the document and sends the submitter an

e-mail notice confirming receipt of the document. The E-Filing system also distributes an e-mail notice that provides access to the document to the NRC's Office of the General Counsel and any others who have advised the Office of the Secretary that they wish to participate in the proceeding, so that the filer need not serve the document on those participants separately. Therefore, applicants and other participants (or their counsel or representative) must apply for and receive a digital ID certificate before adjudicatory documents are filed so that they can obtain access to the documents via the E-Filing system.

A person filing electronically using the NRC's adjudicatory E-Filing system may seek assistance by contacting the NRC's Electronic Filing Help Desk through the "Contact Us" link located on the NRC's public Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals.html>, by e-mail to [MSHD.Resource@nrc.gov](mailto:MSHD.Resource@nrc.gov), or by a toll-free call at 1-866-672-7640. The NRC Electronic Filing Help Desk is available between 9 a.m. and 6 p.m., Eastern Time, Monday through Friday, excluding government holidays.

Participants who believe that they have a good cause for not submitting documents electronically must file an exemption request, in accordance with 10 CFR 2.302(g), with their initial paper filing stating why there is good cause for not filing electronically and requesting authorization to continue to submit documents in paper format. Such filings must be submitted by: (1) first class mail addressed to the Office of the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, Attention: Rulemaking and Adjudications Staff; or (2) courier, express mail, or expedited delivery service to the Office of the Secretary, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland 20852, Attention: Rulemaking and Adjudications Staff. Participants filing adjudicatory documents in this manner are responsible for serving the document on all other participants. Filing is considered complete by first-class mail as of the time of

deposit in the mail, or by courier, express mail, or expedited delivery service upon depositing the document with the provider of the service. A presiding officer, having granted an exemption request from using E-Filing, may require a participant or party to use E-Filing if the presiding officer subsequently determines that the reason for granting the exemption from use of E-Filing no longer exists.

Documents submitted in adjudicatory proceedings will appear in the NRC's electronic hearing docket which is available to the public at <https://adams.nrc.gov/ehd>, unless excluded pursuant to an order of the Commission or the presiding officer. If you do not have an NRC-issued digital ID certificate as described above, click cancel when the link requests certificates and you will be automatically directed to the NRC's electronic hearing dockets where you will be able to access any publicly available documents in a particular hearing docket. Participants are requested not to include personal privacy information, such as social security numbers, home addresses, or personal phone numbers in their filings, unless an NRC regulation or other law requires submission of such information. For example, in some instances, individuals provide home addresses in order to demonstrate proximity to a facility or site. With respect to copyrighted works, except for limited excerpts that serve the purpose of the adjudicatory filings and would constitute a Fair Use application, participants are requested not to include copyrighted materials in their submission.

For further details with respect to these license amendment application(s), see the application for amendment which is available for public inspection in ADAMS and at the NRC's PDR. For additional direction on accessing information related to this document, see the "Obtaining Information and Submitting Comments" section of this document.

Dominion Energy Nuclear Connecticut, Inc., Docket No. 50-336, Millstone Power Station, Unit No. 2, New London County, Connecticut

Date of amendment request: January 17, 2019. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML19023A427.

Description of amendment request: The amendment would modify the Millstone Power Station, Unit No. 2, licensing basis by the addition of a license condition to allow for the implementation of the provisions of 10 CFR 50.69, "Risk-Informed Categorization and Treatment of Structures, Systems and Components for Nuclear Power Reactors."

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

1. Does the proposed change involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The proposed change will permit the use of a risk-informed categorization process to modify the scope of structures, systems and components (SSCs) subject to special treatment requirements and to implement alternative treatments per the regulations. The process used to evaluate SSCs for changes to special treatment requirements and the use of alternative requirements ensures the ability of the SSCs to perform their design function. The potential change to special treatment requirements does not change the design and operation of the SSCs. As a result, the proposed change does not significantly affect any initiators to accidents previously evaluated or the ability to mitigate any accidents previously evaluated. The consequences of the accidents previously evaluated are not affected because the mitigation functions performed by the SSCs assumed in the safety analysis are not being modified. The SSCs required to safely shut down the reactor and maintain it in a safe shutdown condition following an accident will continue to perform their design functions.

Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. Does the proposed change create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The proposed change will permit the use of a risk-informed categorization process to modify the scope of SSCs subject to special treatment requirements and to implement alternative treatments per the regulations. The proposed change does not change the functional requirements, configuration, or method of operation of any SSC. Under the proposed change, no additional plant equipment will be installed.

Therefore, the proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

3. Does the proposed change involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

Response: No.

The proposed change will permit the use of a risk-informed categorization process to modify the scope of SSCs subject to special treatment requirements and to implement alternative treatments per the regulations. The proposed change does not affect any Safety Limits or operating parameters used to establish the safety margin. The safety margins included in analyses of accidents are not affected by the proposed change. The regulation requires that there be no significant effect on plant risk due to any change to the special treatment requirements for SSCs and that the SSCs continue to be capable of performing their design basis functions, as well as to perform any beyond design basis functions consistent with the categorization process and results.

Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Attorney for licensee: Lillian M. Cuoco, Senior Counsel, Dominion Resources Services, Inc., 120 Tredegar Street, RS-2, Richmond, VA 23219.

NRC Branch Chief: James G. Danna.

Exelon Generation Company, LLC, Docket Nos. 50-352 and 50-353, Limerick  
Generating Station, Units 1 and 2, Montgomery County, Pennsylvania

Date of amendment request: December 13, 2018, as supplemented by letter dated February 14, 2019. Publicly-available versions are in ADAMS under Accession Nos. ML18347B366 and ML19045A011, respectively.

Description of amendment request: The amendments would modify Technical Specification (TS) requirements to permit the use of risk-informed completion times in accordance with Technical Specifications Task Force (TSTF) Traveler TSTF-505, Revision 2, "Provide Risk-Informed Extended Completion Times - RITSTF [Risk-Informed TSTF] Initiative 4b" (ADAMS Accession No. ML18183A493).

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

1. Do the proposed changes involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The proposed changes permit the extension of Completion Times provided the associated risk is assessed and managed in accordance with the NRC approved Risk-Informed Completion Time Program. The proposed changes do not involve a significant increase in the probability of an accident previously evaluated because the changes involve no change to the plant or its modes of operation. The proposed changes do not increase the consequences of an accident because the design-basis mitigation function of the affected systems is not changed and the consequences of an accident during the extended Completion Time are no different from those during the existing Completion Time.

Therefore, the proposed changes do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. Do the proposed changes create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The proposed changes do not change the design, configuration, or method of operation of the plant. The proposed changes do not involve a physical alteration of the plant (no new or different kind of equipment will be installed).

Therefore, the proposed changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

3. Do the proposed changes involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

Response: No.

The proposed changes permit the extension of Completion Times provided that risk is assessed and managed in accordance with the NRC approved Risk-Informed Completion Time Program. The proposed changes implement a risk-informed configuration management program to assure that adequate margins of safety are maintained. Application of these new specifications and the configuration management program considers cumulative effects of multiple systems or components being out of service and does so more effectively than the current TS.

Therefore, the proposed changes do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Attorney for licensee: Tamra Domeyer, Associate General Counsel, Exelon Generation Company, LLC, 4300 Winfield Road, Warrenville, IL 60555.

NRC Branch Chief: James G. Danna.

Exelon Generation Company, LLC, Docket No. 50-289, Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit 1, Dauphin County, Pennsylvania

Date of amendment request: December 14, 2018. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML18351A006.

Description of amendment request: The amendment would revise Technical Specification (TS) 6.8.5 "Reactor Building Leakage Rate Testing Program." The amendment would allow for a one-cycle extension to the 10-year frequency of the Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit 1, containment leakage rate test (i.e., Integrated Leakage Rate Test (ILRT) or Type A test). The proposed change would permit the existing ILRT to be extended from 10 years to 11.75 years. This extension would move the performance of the next ILRT from the scheduled fall 2019 refueling outage to the fall 2021 refueling outage.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

1. Does the proposed amendment involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The proposed amendment to the Technical Specifications (TS) 6.8.5 involves a one-time extension of the Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit 1 (TMI-1), Type A integrated leakage rate test (ILRT) from 10 years to 11.75 years, in accordance with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC)-accepted guidelines of Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI) 94-01, "Industry Guideline for Implementing Performance-Based Option of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J," Revision 3-A. This change will extend the requirement to perform the Type A ILRT from the current requirement of "prior to startup from the T1R18 refueling outage," to "November 2009 Type A test shall be performed no later than prior to startup from the T1R24 refueling outage in 2021.



The proposed extension does not involve either a physical change to the plant or a change in the manner in which the plant is operated or controlled. The containment is designed to provide an essentially leak tight barrier against the uncontrolled release of radioactivity to the environment for postulated accidents. Types B and C testing ensures that individual containment isolation valves (CIVs) are essentially leak tight. In addition, aggregate Types B and C leakage rates support the leakage tightness of primary containment by minimizing potential leakage paths. The proposed amendment will not change the leakage rate acceptance requirements. As such, the containment will continue to perform its design function as a barrier to fission product releases. In addition, the containment and the testing requirements invoked to periodically demonstrate the integrity of the containment exist to ensure the plant's ability to mitigate the consequences of an accident, and do not involve the prevention or identification of any precursors of an accident previously evaluated. Therefore, this proposed interval extension does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

Therefore, the proposed change does not result in a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. Does the proposed change create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The proposed amendment to the TS involves a one-time extension of the TMI-1 Type A ILRT from 10 years to 11.75 years. The containment and the testing requirements to periodically demonstrate the integrity of the containment exist to ensure the plant's ability to mitigate the consequences of an accident do not involve any accident precursors or initiators.

The proposed change does not involve a physical change to the plant (i.e., no new or different type of equipment will be installed) or a change to the manner in which the plant is operated or controlled. This administrative change to extend the Type A ILRT for TMI-1 will not affect the control parameters governing unit operation or the response of plant equipment to transient or accident conditions.

Therefore, the proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated.

3. Does the proposed change involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

Response: No.

The proposed amendment to the TS involves the extension of the TMI-1 Type A ILRT interval to 11.75 years. This amendment does not alter the manner in which safety limits, limiting safety system set points, or limiting conditions for operation are determined. The specific requirements and conditions of the TS 6.8.5, "Reactor Building Leakage Rate Testing Program," for containment leak rate testing exist to ensure that the degree of containment structural integrity and leak-tightness that is considered in the plant safety analysis are maintained. The overall containment leak rate limit specified by TS is maintained.

The proposed change involves the extension of the interval for only the Type A containment leakage rate test at TMI-1. The proposed surveillance interval extension is bounded by the 15-year Type A test interval currently authorized within NEI 94-01, Revision 3-A. The design, operation, testing methods, and acceptance criteria for Types A, B, and C containment leakage tests specified in applicable codes and standards would continue to be met with the acceptance of this proposed change, since these are not affected by the proposed change to the Type A test interval.

Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Attorney for licensee: Tamra Domeyer, Associate General Counsel, Exelon Generation Company, LLC, 4300 Winfield Road, Warrenville, IL 60555.

NRC Branch Chief: James G. Danna.

Indiana Michigan Power Company, Docket Nos. 50-315 and 50-316, Donald C. Cook Nuclear Plant (CNP), Units 1 and 2, Berrien County, Michigan

Date of amendment request: December 11, 2018. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML18348A579.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendments would modify the Operating Licenses, Appendix B, Environmental Technical Specifications, Part II, "Non-Radiological Environmental Protection Plan," for CNP, Units 1 and 2. The amendment request would update the Environmental Protection Plan to reflect a Michigan State requirement to obtain and maintain a Renewable Operating Permit for the possession and operation of specified stationary sources of air pollutants and other editorial changes.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

1. Does the proposed change involve a significant increase in the probability of occurrence or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The Environmental Protection Plan (EPP) is concerned with monitoring the effect that plant operations have on the environment for the purpose of protecting the environment and has no effect on any accident postulated in the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR). Accident probabilities or consequences are not affected in any way by obtaining an environmental monitoring permit and reporting required by the EPP. The revision of portions of Appendix B of the Operating Licenses will not impact the design or operation of any plant system or component. No environmental protection requirements established by other federal, state, or local agencies are being reduced by this license amendment request.

Therefore, the proposed changes do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. Does the proposed change create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

Obtaining an environmental monitoring permit and reporting have no effect on accident initiation. The revision to portions of Appendix B of the Operating Licenses will not impact the design or operation of any plant system or component. There will be no impact upon the type or amount of any effluents released from CNP.

Therefore, the proposed changes do not create the possibility of a new or, different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

3. Does the proposed change involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

Response: No.

The change to add permit and reporting requirements and other administrative revisions has no impact on margin of safety. Environmental evaluations will continue to be performed, when necessary, on changes to plant design or operations to assess the effect on environmental protection.

Therefore, the proposed changes do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involve no significant hazards consideration.

Attorney for licensee: Robert B. Haemer, Senior Nuclear Counsel, One Cook Place, Bridgman, MI 49106.

NRC Branch Chief: David J. Wrona.

PSEG Nuclear LLC, and Exelon Generation Company, LLC, Docket Nos. 50-272 and 50-311, Salem Nuclear Generating Station (Salem), Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Salem County, New Jersey

Date of amendment request: February 4, 2019. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML19035A620.

Description of amendment request: The amendments would revise the Salem Technical Specification (TS) requirements on control and shutdown rods and rod and bank position indication, consistent with NRC-approved Technical Specifications Task Force (TSTF) Traveler TSTF-547, Revision 1, "Clarification of Rod Position Requirements," dated March 4, 2016.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

1. Does the proposed amendment involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

Control and shutdown rods are assumed to insert into the core to shut down the reactor in evaluated accidents. Rod insertion limits ensure that adequate negative reactivity is available to provide the assumed shutdown margin (SDM). Rod alignment and overlap limits maintain an appropriate power distribution and reactivity insertion profile.

Control and shutdown rods are initiators to several accidents previously evaluated, such as rod ejection. The proposed change does not change the limiting conditions for operation for the rods or make any technical changes to the Surveillance Requirements (SRs) governing the rods. Therefore, the proposed change has no significant effect on the probability of any accident previously evaluated.

Revising the TS Actions to provide a limited time to repair rod movement control has no effect on the SDM assumed in the accident analysis as the proposed Actions require verification that SDM is maintained. The effects on power distribution will not cause a significant increase in the consequences of any accident previously evaluated as all TS requirements on power distribution continue to be applicable.

Revising the TS Actions to provide an alternative to frequent use of the moveable incore detector system to verify the position of rods with inoperable rod position indicators does not change the requirement for the rods to be aligned and within the insertion limits.

Therefore, the assumptions used in any accidents previously evaluated are unchanged and there is no significant increase in the consequences.

The consequences of an accident that might occur during the 1 hour period provided for the analog rod position indication to stabilize after rod movement are no different than the consequences of the accident under the existing actions with the rod declared inoperable.

The proposed change to resolve the conflicts in the TS ensure that the intended Actions are followed when equipment is inoperable. Actions taken with inoperable equipment are not assumptions in the accidents previously evaluated and have no significant effect on the consequences.

Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. Does the proposed amendment create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The proposed change does not involve a physical alteration of the plant (i.e., no new or different type of equipment will be installed). The change does not alter assumptions made in the safety analyses. The proposed change does not alter the limiting conditions for operation for the rods or make any technical changes to the SRs governing the rods. The proposed change to actions maintains or improves safety when equipment is inoperable and does not introduce new failure modes.

Therefore, the proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated.

3. Does the proposed amendment involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

Response: No.

The proposed change to allow time for rod position indication to stabilize after rod movement and to allow an alternative method of

verifying rod position has no effect on the safety margin as actual rod position is not affected. The proposed change to provide time to repair rods that are operable but immovable does not result in a significant reduction in the margin of safety because all rods must be verified to be Operable, and all other banks must be within the insertion limits. The remaining proposed changes to make the requirements internally consistent do not affect the margin of safety as the changes do not affect the ability of the rods to perform their specified safety function.

Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Attorney for licensee: Steven Fleischer, PSEG Services Corporation, 80 Park Plaza, T-5, Newark, NJ 07102.

NRC Branch Chief: James G. Danna.

Southern Nuclear Operating Company, Inc., Georgia Power Company, Oglethorpe Power Corporation, Municipal Electric Authority of Georgia, City of Dalton, Georgia, Docket Nos. 50-321 and 50-366, Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Appling County, Georgia

Date of amendment request: April 4, 2018. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Package Accession No. ML18096A936.

Description of amendment request: The amendments would revise Renewed Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-5 and DPR-57 for the Hatch Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2, respectively. The amendments would approve the adoption of a new fire protection licensing basis which complies with the requirements in 10 CFR 50.48(a), 10 CFR 50.48(c), and the guidance in Regulatory Guide 1.205, Revision 1.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by

10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

1. Does the transition to NFPA 805 [proposed amendment] involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

Operation of Hatch Nuclear Plant Units 1 and 2 in accordance with the proposed amendment does not increase the probability or consequences of accidents previously evaluated. Engineering analyses, which may include engineering evaluations, probabilistic safety assessments, and fire modeling calculations, have been performed to demonstrate that the performance-based requirements of NFPA 805 have been satisfied. The Updated Final Safety Analysis Report documents the analyses of design basis accidents at Hatch Nuclear Plant Units 1 and 2. The proposed amendment does not affect accident initiators, nor does it alter design assumptions, conditions, or configurations of the facility that would increase the probability of accidents previously evaluated. Further, the changes to be made for fire hazard protection and mitigation do not adversely affect the ability of structures, systems, or components to perform their design functions for accident mitigation, nor do they affect the postulated initiators or assumed failure modes for accidents described and evaluated in the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report. Structures, systems, or components required to safely shutdown the reactor and to maintain it in a safe shutdown condition will remain capable of performing their design functions.

The purpose of the proposed amendment is to permit Hatch Nuclear Plant Units 1 and 2 to adopt a new fire protection licensing basis which complies with the requirements of 10 CFR 50.48(a) and (c) and the guidance in Regulatory Guide 1.205. The NRC considers that NFPA 805 provides an acceptable methodology and performance criteria for licensees to identify fire protection requirements that are an acceptable alternative to the 10 CFR 50 Appendix R required fire protection features (69 Fed. Reg. 33536, June 16, 2004). Engineering analyses, which may include engineering evaluations, probabilistic safety assessments, and fire modeling calculations, have been performed to demonstrate that the performance-based requirements of NFPA 805 have been met.

NFPA [805] taken as a whole, provides an acceptable alternative for satisfying General Design Criterion 3 (GDC 3) of Appendix A to



10 CFR 50, meets the underlying intent of the NRC's existing fire protection regulations and guidance, and provides for defense-in-depth. The goals, performance objectives, and performance criteria specified in Chapter 1 of the standard ensure that, if there are any increases in core damage frequency or risk, the increase will be small and consistent with the intent of the Commission's Safety Goal Policy.

Based on this, the implementation of the proposed amendment does not increase the probability of any accident previously evaluated. Equipment required to mitigate an accident remains capable of performing the assumed function(s). The proposed amendment will not affect the source term, containment isolation, or radiological release assumptions used in evaluating the radiological consequences of any accident previously evaluated. The applicable radiological dose criteria will continue to be met. Therefore, the consequences of any accident previously evaluated are not increased with the implementation of the proposed amendment.

2. Does the transition to NFPA 805 [proposed amendment] create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

Operation of Hatch Nuclear Plant Units 1 and 2 in accordance with the proposed amendment does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated. The proposed change does not alter the requirements or functions for systems required during accident conditions. Implementation of the new fire protection licensing basis which complies with the requirements of 10 CFR 50.48(a) and (c) and the guidance [in] Regulatory Guide 1.205 will not result in new or different accidents.

The proposed amendment does not introduce new or different accident initiators, nor does it alter design assumptions, conditions, or configurations of the facility. The proposed amendment does not adversely affect the ability of structures, systems, or components to perform their design function. Structures, systems, or components required to safely shutdown the reactor and maintain it in a safe shutdown condition remain capable of performing their design functions.

The purpose of the proposed amendment is to permit Hatch Nuclear Plant Units 1 and 2 to adopt a new fire protection licensing basis which complies with the requirements of 10 CFR 50.48(a) and (c) and the guidance in Regulatory Guide 1.205. The NRC considers that NFPA 805 provides an acceptable

methodology and appropriate performance criteria for licensees to identify fire protection systems and features that are an acceptable alternative to the 10 CFR 50, Appendix R required fire protection features (69 Fed. Reg. 33536, June 16, 2004).

The requirements of NFPA 805 address only fire protection and the impacts of fire on the plant that have previously been evaluated, with the exception of including requirements for radiological release performance criteria and non-Power Operation fire safety criteria, and alignment with plant down powers below hot shutdown. Based on this, implementation of the proposed amendment would not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any kind of accident previously evaluated. No new accident scenarios, transient precursors, failure mechanisms, or limiting single failures will be introduced as a result of this amendment. There will be no adverse effect or challenges imposed on any safety-related system as a result of this amendment. Therefore, the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any kind of accident previously evaluated is not created with the implementation of the proposed amendment.

3. Does the transition to NFPA 805 [proposed amendment] involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

Response: No.

Operation of Hatch Nuclear Plant Units 1 and 2 in accordance with the proposed amendment does not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety. The proposed amendment does not alter the manner in which safety limits, limiting safety system settings or limiting conditions for operation are determined. The safety analysis acceptance criteria are not affected by this change. The proposed amendment does not adversely affect existing plant safety margins or the reliability of equipment assumed to mitigate accidents in the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report. The proposed amendment does not adversely affect the ability of structures, systems, or components to perform their design function. Structures, systems, or components required to safely shut down the reactor and to maintain it in a safe shutdown condition, remain capable of performing their design functions.

The purpose of the proposed amendment is to permit Hatch Nuclear Plant Units 1 and 2 to adopt a new fire protection licensing basis which complies with the requirements in 10 CFR 50.48(a) and (c) and the guidance in Regulatory Guide 1.205. The NRC considers that NFPA 805 provides an acceptable methodology and performance criteria for licensees to identify fire protection systems and features that are an acceptable alternative to the 10 CFR 50 Appendix R required fire protection features (69 Fed. Reg. 33536, June 16, 2004). Engineering analyses, which

may include engineering evaluations, probabilistic safety assessments, and fire modeling calculations, have been performed to demonstrate that the performance based requirements of NFPA 805 do not result in a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

The proposed changes are evaluated to ensure that risk and safety margins are kept within acceptable limits. The risk informed fire protection scenarios and resolutions ensure fire risk analyses are performed and are only successful if adequate safety margin and defense-in-depth is maintained. Therefore, the transition to NFPA 805 does not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Attorney for licensee: Millicent Ronnlund, Vice President and General Counsel,  
Southern Nuclear Operating Co., Inc., P. O. Box 1295, Birmingham, AL 35201-1295.

NRC Branch Chief: Michael T. Markley.

Southern Nuclear Operating Company, Inc., Georgia Power Company, Oglethorpe  
Power Corporation, Municipal Electric Authority of Georgia, City of Dalton, Georgia,  
Docket Nos. 50-321 and 50-366, Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2,  
Appling County, Georgia

Date of amendment request: June 7, 2018. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML18158A583.

Description of amendment request: The amendments would revise Renewed Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-57 and NPF-5 for the Hatch Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2, respectively, to add a condition to each license allowing for the implementation of the

provisions of 10 CFR 50.69, "Risk-informed categorization and treatment of structures, systems and components [(SSCs)] for nuclear power reactors."

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

1. Does the proposed change involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The proposed change will permit the use of a risk-informed categorization process to modify the scope of SSCs subject to NRC special treatment requirements and to implement alternative treatments per the regulations. The process used to evaluate SSCs for changes to NRC special treatment requirements and the use of alternative requirements ensures the ability of the SSCs to perform their design function. The potential change to special treatment requirements does not change the design and operation of the SSCs. As a result, the proposed change does not significantly affect any initiators to accidents previously evaluated or the ability to mitigate any accidents previously evaluated. The consequences of the accidents previously evaluated are not affected because the mitigation functions performed by the SSCs assumed in the safety analysis are not being modified. The SSCs required to safely shut down the reactor and maintain it in a safe shutdown condition following an accident will continue to perform their design functions.

Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. Does the proposed change create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The proposed change will permit the use of a risk-informed categorization process to modify the scope of SSCs subject to NRC special treatment requirements and to implement alternative treatments per the regulations. The proposed change does not change the functional requirements, configuration, or method of operation of any SSC. Under the proposed change, no additional plant equipment will be installed.

Therefore, the proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

3. Does proposed change involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

Response: No.

The proposed change will permit the use of a risk-informed categorization process to modify the scope of SSCs subject to NRC special treatment requirements and to implement alternative treatments per the regulations. The proposed change does not affect any Safety Limits or operating parameters used to establish the safety margin. The safety margins included in analyses of accidents are not affected by the proposed change. The regulation requires that there be no significant effect on plant risk due to any change to the special treatment requirements for SSCs and that the SSCs continue to be capable of performing their design basis functions, as well as to perform any beyond design basis functions consistent with the categorization process and results.

Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Attorney for licensee: Millicent Ronnlund, Vice President and General Counsel,  
Southern Nuclear Operating Co., Inc., P. O. Box 1295, Birmingham, AL 35201-1295.

NRC Branch Chief: Michael T. Markley.

Southern Nuclear Operating Company, Inc. (SNC), Georgia Power Company,  
Oglethorpe Power Corporation, Municipal Electric Authority of Georgia, City of Dalton,  
Georgia, Docket Nos. 50-321 and 50-366, Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and  
2, Appling County, Georgia

Date of amendment request: October 17, 2018. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML18290A940.

Description of amendment request: The amendments would modify the required actions associated with the Hatch Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2, Technical Specification (TS) 3.6.4.1, "Secondary Containment," to allow up to 7 days to determine and correct the cause of secondary containment degradation when at least one combination of standby gas treatment (SGT) subsystems can maintain adequate secondary containment vacuum.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

1. Does the proposed amendment involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The secondary containment is not an initiator of any accident previously evaluated but is assumed to mitigate some accidents previously evaluated. However, the proposed change does not alter the design or safety function of the secondary containment or associated support systems. Therefore, the probability of an accident previously evaluated is not increased.

The consequences of accidents previously evaluated that assume the secondary containment function in accident mitigation are not altered by the proposed change. The change includes proposed requirements to verify at least one or more Operable SGT subsystems can establish and maintain vacuum within the required time assumed in the safety analysis, thereby conserving the safety analysis assumptions. Therefore, the consequences of any accident that assumes the secondary containment function are not affected by this change.

Consequently, the proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. Does the proposed amendment create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The proposed change does not change the design function or operation of the secondary containment function. No plant modifications or changes to the plant configuration or method of operation are involved. The change includes proposed requirements to verify at least one or more Operable SGT subsystems can establish and maintain vacuum within the required time assumed in the safety analysis.

Therefore, the proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

3. Does proposed amendment involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

Response: No.

The proposed change does not affect any of the controlling values or parameters used to avoid exceeding regulatory or licensing limits. The proposed change does not exceed or alter the design basis or safety limits, or any limiting safety system settings. The requirement for the secondary containment to perform its designated safety function is unaffected. The proposed change provides additional action requirements similar to action requirements currently provided in the SGT system TS for a similar condition. The risk of providing additional time to restore the leak-tightness of the secondary containment to support any combination of SGT subsystems is offset by the proposed requirements to verify at least one or more Operable SGT subsystems can establish and maintain vacuum within the required time periods. Because the secondary containments for both Units 1 and 2 are interconnected during plant operation, the proposed change also reduces the need for a dual unit shutdown and the associated risk during this condition by allowing more time to identify the degraded components and restore the secondary containments to Operable status. SNC has determined that the acceptability of the allowable outage time for a single SGT subsystem, which was previously evaluated, is also acceptable for the allowable outage time for the secondary containment in the proposed conditions.

Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Attorney for licensee: Millicent Ronnlund, Vice President and General Counsel, Southern Nuclear Operating Co., Inc., P. O. Box 1295, Birmingham, AL 35201-1295.

NRC Branch Chief: Michael T. Markley.

Virginia Electric and Power Company, Docket Nos. 50-338 and 50-339, North Anna Power Station, Units No. 1 and No. 2, Louisa County, Virginia

Date of amendment request: November 19, 2018. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML18334A106.

Description of amendment request: The amendments would revise Renewed Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-4 and NPF-7 for the North Anna Power Station, Units 1 and 2, respectively, by approving the installation of two non-safety-related water headers (fire protection and domestic water) within the safety-related flood protection dike, along with corresponding changes to the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR).

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

1. Does the proposed amendment involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The change revises the UFSAR to reflect the addition of non safety-related, underground, fire protection and domestic water system piping within the safety-related flood protection dike west of the Unit 2 Turbine Building. Failure of non safety-related piping



within the flood protection dike or failure of the flood protection dike is not an initiator of any accident previously evaluated. The modification does not significantly increase the probability of a failure to the flood protection dike. The technical evaluation for the change shows that slope stability for the flood protection dike is maintained in the event of a non safety-related piping failure. In addition, existing inspections and surveillances are adequate to identify piping leaks or breaks prior to failure of the flood protection dike. In the event a piping break causes a failure of the flood protection dike, a risk review indicates that the probability of this occurring with consequences to be low (not significant).

2. Does the proposed amendment create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The change revises the UFSAR to reflect the addition of non safety-related, underground, fire protection and domestic water system piping within the safety-related flood protection dike. The flood protection dike is located west of the Unit 2 Turbine and Service Buildings, and provides flood protection to those buildings if Lake Anna reached the PMF [probable maximum flood] level. The addition of the non safety-related piping within the flood protection dike does not change the design function or operation of the flood protection dike. A failure of the flood protection dike is not an accident initiator. Failure of the non safety-related piping could potentially degrade the safety-related flood protection dike; however, it does not introduce a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

3. Does proposed amendment involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

Response: No.

The change has no significant impact on margins of safety. The installation of the non safety-related piping does not result in a reduction of a peak flood protection dike height. An analysis demonstrated that slope stability is maintained and factors of safety are well within acceptable limits during installation and following installation, including in the event of a pipe break. Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC

staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Attorney for licensee: Mr. W.S. Blair, Senior Counsel, Dominion Energy Services, Inc.,  
120 Tredegar Street, RS-2, Richmond, VA 23219.

NRC Branch Chief: Michael T. Markley.

#### **IV. Notice of Issuance of Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses and Combined Licenses**

During the period since publication of the last biweekly notice, the Commission has issued the following amendments. The Commission has determined for each of these amendments that the application complies with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission's rules and regulations. The Commission has made appropriate findings as required by the Act and the Commission's rules and regulations in 10 CFR chapter I, which are set forth in the license amendment.

A notice of consideration of issuance of amendment to facility operating license or combined license, as applicable, proposed no significant hazards consideration determination, and opportunity for a hearing in connection with these actions, was published in the *Federal Register* as indicated.

Unless otherwise indicated, the Commission has determined that these amendments satisfy the criteria for categorical exclusion in accordance with 10 CFR 51.22. Therefore, pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b), no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need be prepared for these amendments. If the Commission has prepared an environmental assessment under the special circumstances provision

in 10 CFR 51.22(b) and has made a determination based on that assessment, it is so indicated.

For further details with respect to the action see (1) the applications for amendment, (2) the amendment, and (3) the Commission's related letter, Safety Evaluation and/or Environmental Assessment as indicated. All of these items can be accessed as described in the "Obtaining Information and Submitting Comments" section of this document.

Exelon Generation Company, LLC, and PSEG Nuclear LLC, Docket Nos. 50-277 and 50-278, Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Units 2 and 3, York and Lancaster Counties, Pennsylvania

Date of amendment request: August 27, 2018.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments revised compensatory measures in the Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Units 2 and 3, Technical Requirements Manual to permit operation of the Leading Edge Flow Meter (LEFM) system at three separate intermediate power levels for an indefinite period when the mass flow input to the core thermal power calculation is from one, two, or three feedwater lines in Check mode with none in Fail mode, and to permit operation of the LEFM system at a fourth intermediate power level when not more than one LEFM is in Fail mode and flow measurement is being provided by the associated feedwater flow nozzle. The changes allow operation at power levels commensurate with the uncertainties in the measurement of core thermal power and reduce the magnitude of the required reactivity maneuver and plant power level change for degradation of the LEFM system.

Date of issuance: February 26, 2019.

Effective date: As of the date of issuance and shall be implemented immediately upon issuance.

Amendment Nos.: 324 (Unit 2) and 327 (Unit 3). A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML19039A223; documents related to these amendments are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendments.

Renewed Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-44 and DPR-56: The amendments revised Section 3.20 of the Technical Requirements Manual.

Date of initial notice in *Federal Register*: November 6, 2018 (83 FR 55566).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 26, 2019.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Exelon Generation Company, LLC, Docket Nos. 50-277 and 50-278, Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Units 2 and 3, York County, Pennsylvania

Date of amendment request: May 30, 2018, as supplemented by letter dated December 6, 2018.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments revised the Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Units 2 and 3, Technical Specifications to allow continued operation with two safety relief valves/safety valves out of service and to increase the reactor coolant system pressure safety limit. Specifically, the amendments revised Technical Specification Safety Limit 2.1.2 and Limiting Condition for Operation 3.4.3 for both Units 2 and 3.

Date of issuance: February 26, 2019.

Effective date: As of the date of issuance and shall be implemented within 60 days of issuance.

Amendment Nos.: 323 (Unit 2) and 326 (Unit 3). A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML19011A325; documents related to these amendments are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendments.

Renewed Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-44 and DPR-56: The amendments revised the Renewed Facility Operating Licenses and Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in *Federal Register*: November 6, 2018 (83 FR 55564). The supplemental letter dated December 6, 2018, provided additional information that clarified the application, did not expand the scope of the application as originally noticed, and did not change the NRC staff's original proposed no significant hazards consideration determined as published in the *Federal Register*.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 26, 2019.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Exelon Generation Company, LLC, Docket Nos. 50-352 and 50-353, Limerick Generating Station, Units 1 and 2, Montgomery County, Pennsylvania

Date of amendment request: August 23, 2018.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments modified the Technical Specification requirements for inoperable dynamic restraints (snubbers) by adding a new Limiting Condition for Operation (LCO) 3.0.8. The changes are based on Technical Specifications Task Force (TSTF) Traveler TSTF 372, Revision 4, "Addition of LCO 3.0.8, Inoperability of Snubbers."

Date of issuance: February 28, 2019.

Effective date: As of the date of issuance and shall be implemented no later than May 31, 2019.

Amendment Nos.: 234 and 197. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML19036A913; documents related to these amendments are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendments.

Renewed Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-39 and NPF-85: The amendments revised the Renewed Facility Operating License and Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in *Federal Register*: October 23, 2018 (83 FR 53513).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 28, 2019.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

FirstEnergy Nuclear Operating Company, Docket No. 50-412, Beaver Valley Power Station, Unit 2, Beaver County, Pennsylvania

Date of amendment request: March 28, 2018, as supplemented by letter dated October 28, 2018.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revised various Technical Specification (TS) sections associated with steam generators to allow the use of Westinghouse leak-limiting Alloy 800 sleeves for an additional three fuel cycles of operation, bringing the total usage time from five to eight fuel cycles of operation. The Technical Specification changes also clarified wording in two sections related to use of the leak-limiting Alloy 800 sleeves.

Date of issuance: February 25, 2019.

Effective date: As of the date of issuance and shall be implemented within 60 days.

Amendment No.: 193. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML18348B206; documents related to this amendment are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendment.

Renewed Facility Operating License No. NPF-73: The amendment revised the Renewed Facility Operating License and Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in *Federal Register*: June 5, 2018 (83 FR 26105). The supplemental letter dated October 28, 2018, provided additional information that clarified the application, did not expand the scope of the application as originally noticed, and did not change the NRC staff's original proposed no significant hazards consideration determination as published in the *Federal Register*.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a safety evaluation dated February 25, 2019.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

PSEG Nuclear LLC, Docket Nos. 50-354, 50-272, and 50-311, Hope Creek Generating Station (Hope Creek) and Salem Nuclear Generating Station (Salem), Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Salem County, New Jersey

Date of amendment request: June 29, 2018.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments revised Technical Specification requirements in Section 3/4.0, "Applicability," regarding limiting condition for operation and surveillance requirement usage. These changes are consistent with NRC-approved Technical Specifications Task Force (TSTF) Traveler TSTF-529, "Clarify Use and Application Rules."

Date of issuance: March 6, 2019.

Effective date: As of the date of issuance and shall be implemented within 60 days of issuance.

Amendment Nos.: 214 (Hope Creek), 327 (Salem, Unit No. 1), and 308 (Salem, Unit No. 2). A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML19044A627;

documents related to these amendments are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendments.

Renewed Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-57, DPR-70, and DPR-75: The amendments revised the Renewed Facility Operating Licenses and Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in *Federal Register*: August 14, 2018 (83 FR 40351).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated March 6, 2019.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

South Carolina Electric & Gas Company, South Carolina Public Service Authority, Docket No. 50-395, Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1, Fairfield County, South Carolina

Date of amendment request: October 8, 2018, as supplemented by letter dated February 22, 2019.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revised the surveillance frequency of Technical Specification 3/4.4.6 Reactor Coolant System Leakage, Surveillance Requirement 4.4.6.2.2 a, to allow the reactor coolant system pressure isolation valve leakage test to be extended to a performance-based frequency not to exceed 3 refueling outages (to a maximum of 60 months) following two consecutive satisfactory tests.

Date of issuance: March 7, 2019.

Effective date: As of the date of issuance and shall be implemented within 60 days of issuance.



Amendment No.: 213. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML19023A420, documents related to this amendment are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendment.

Renewed Facility Operating License No. NPF-12: The amendment revised the Renewed Facility Operating License and the Technical Specification.

Date of initial notice in *Federal Register*: November 20, 2018 (83 FR 58615). The supplemental letter dated February 22, 2019, provided additional information that clarified the application, did not expand the scope of the application as originally noticed, and did not change the staff's original proposed no significant hazards consideration determination as published in the *Federal Register*.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated March 7, 2019.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Virginia Electric and Power Company, Docket Nos. 50-338 and 50-339, North Anna Power Station (North Anna), Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Louisa County, Virginia, and Docket Nos. 50-280 and 50-281, Surry Power Station (Surry), Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Surry County, Virginia

Date of amendment request: January 16, 2018, as supplemented by letters dated June 13, and September 18, 2018.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments authorized changes to the North Anna and Surry emergency plans and allowed the consolidation of both sites' previous emergency operations facilities into a central emergency operations facility.

Date of issuance: February 27, 2019.

Effective date: As of the date of issuance and shall be implemented within 180 days of issuance.

Amendment Nos.: 281 (Unit No. 1) and 264 (Unit No. 2) for North Anna, and 294 (Unit No. 1) and 294 (Unit No. 2) for Surry. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML19031B227; documents related to these amendments are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendments.

Renewed Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-4, NPF-7, DPR-32, and DPR-37: The amendments revised the North Anna and Surry emergency plans.

Date of initial notice in *Federal Register*: September 11, 2018 (83 FR 45981). The supplemental letters dated June 13, and September 18, 2018, provided additional information that clarified the application, did not expand the scope of the application as originally noticed, and did not change the staff's original proposed no significant hazards consideration determination as published in the *Federal Register*.

The Commission's related evaluation of these amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 27, 2019.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 15<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2019

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Craig G. Erlanger, Director,  
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing,  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 2019-05266 Filed: 3/25/2019 8:45 am; Publication Date: 3/26/2019]